

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION

JOE ANDREW SALAZAR

§

Plaintiff,

§

v.

Case No. 2:16-cv-1096-JRG-RSP

HTC CORPORATION et al.,

§

Defendants.

§

**RENEWED MOTION TO DISMISS AS TO SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT  
PURSUANT TO FEDERAL RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 12(b)(6)**

Defendant HTC Corporation (“HTC”) moves to dismiss Plaintiff’s Second Amended Original Complaint for Patent Infringement (Dkt. # 44), (the “Second Amended Complaint”) for the reasons set forth in HTC’s pending Motion to Dismiss First Amended Original Complaint Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) (Dkt. # 28) and HTC’s Reply in support of that motion to dismiss (Dkt. # 36).

Plaintiff’s Second Amended Complaint (Dkt. # 44), filed on June 15, 2017, for the first time adds AT&T, Inc. (“AT&T”) as a defendant. The Second Amended Complaint adds three new paragraphs (¶¶ 5, 6, 11), which contain allegations related solely to AT&T. As to the remaining allegations, Plaintiff has made only minor, non-substantive revisions to the allegations found in his First Amended Complaint (Dkt. #17), primarily to change references to “Defendant” to references to “Defendants.”

None of the changes in Plaintiff’s Second Amended Complaint alter or remedy the deficiencies identified in HTC’s pending Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. #28). For the convenience of the Court, a redlined version of Plaintiff’s Second Amended Complaint, showing these changes

is attached hereto as Exhibit A. The addition of new paragraphs 5, 6, and 11 in the Second Amended Complaint also changed the numbers of certain other paragraphs that contain the allegations corresponding to those First Amended Complaint, which are cited in HTC's pending Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. # 28) and HTC's reply brief (Dkt. # 36). The following chart shows the correspondence between the paragraph numbers cited by HTC in its briefs and the renumbers paragraphs in the SecondAmended Complaint

<b>First Amended Complaint (Dkt. # 17)(cited in HTC's motion and reply brief)</b>	<b>Second Amended Complaint (Dkt. # 44)</b>
¶ 5	¶ 7
¶ 11	¶ 13
¶ 14	¶ 16
¶ 15	¶ 17
¶ 16	¶ 18
¶ 17	¶ 19
¶ 18	¶ 20
¶ 19	¶ 21
¶ 21	¶ 23

In order to avoid burdening the Court with duplicative briefing, HTC adopts and renews the statements and arguments in HTC's previously-filed motions to dismiss (Dkt. # 28) and reply (Dkt. # 36). If the Court wishes HTC to refile the earlier briefing with references to the Second Amended Complaint, HTC will promptly comply.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jerry R. Selinger

Jerry R. Selinger  
State Bar No. 18008250  
PATTERSON + SHERIDAN, LLP  
Email: [jselinger@pattersonsheridan.com](mailto:jselinger@pattersonsheridan.com)  
Trampas A. Kurth  
State Bar No. 24055807  
Email: [tkurth@pattersonsheridan.com](mailto:tkurth@pattersonsheridan.com)  
1700 Pacific Avenue, Suite 2650  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
Telephone: 214-272-0957  
Facsimile: 713-623-4846

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT  
HTC CORPORATION

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on June 23, 2017, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the clerk of court for the U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Texas, using the electronic case filing (“ECF”) system of the court. The attorneys of record who have consented in writing to accept notice as service of this document by electronic means are being served pursuant to Local Rule CV-5(a)(3) by a “Notice of Electronic Filing,” sent by the ECF system.

/s/ Jerry R. Selinger